				s		lina Cases March 31,	of HIV and AID 2007	)S			
			AIDC (	·		1		1115	/ 0		
County/	Cumulat	ive Throug	AIDS O		.lan 1-De	c.31,2006	Cumulative	HIV Through Marc	/ Cases	Jan.1-Dec	31 2006
District	Cases	Rate	Rank	Deaths	Cases	Rate	Cases	Rate	Rank	Cases	Rate
Total*	16,697	386.4		7671	720	16.7	21,963	508.3		779	18.0
Abbeville	31	119.5	44	11			57	219.8	43		
Aiken	303	199.6	33	179	7	4.6	545	359.0	28	18	11.9
Allendale	50	465.2	11	22			83		9		
Anderson	262	147.2	42	132	11	6.2	406	228.1	42	13	7.3
Bamberg Barnwell	107 114	682.5 490.0	7	49 48	8 13	51.0 55.9	184 172	1174.0 739.3	11	8 11	51.0 47.3
Beaufort	266	187.3	38	117	20	14.1	457	321.7	31	22	15.5
Berkeley	255	167.5	40	119	11	7.2	366		41	15	9.9
Calhoun	44	292.8	21	21			44	292.8	38		
Charleston Cherokee	1,575 76	474.5 141.0	9 43	831 38	60	18.1	2,613 110	787.2 204.1	6 44	65	19.6
Chester	60	182.5	39	26			105	319.4	32		
Chesterfield	84	194.5	35	42			124		39	6	13.9
Clarendon	168	503.9	6	72	8	24.0	238	713.9	13	7	21.0
Colleton Darlington	153 234	387.7 346.4	15 17	73 107	9	13.3	239 357	605.6 528.5	17 19	. 7	10.4
Danington	102	346.4	19	48	9	29.0	177	571.3	18	11	35.5
Dorchester	244	205.1	32	105	13	10.9	351	295.0		14	11.8
Edgefield	67	265.2	24	33			198	783.8	7		
Fairfield	76	319.2	20	31			112	470.4	22		
Florence Georgetown	533 206	405.9 338.5	14 18	250 104	24 7	18.3 11.5	971 320	739.5 525.8	10 21	37 12	28.2 19.7
Greenville	1,044	250.3	25	534	51	12.2	1,640		26	51	12.2
Greenwood	154	225.8	28	65	7	10.3	281	411.9	25	12	17.6
Hampton	77	362.0	16	34			140	658.3	15	6	28.2
Horry	569	238.6	26	260	32	13.4	1,046		23	41	17.2
Jasper Kershaw	103 158	472.3 274.8	10 22	52 72	6 13	27.5 22.6	148 249	678.6 433.1	14 24	8 13	36.7 22.6
Lancaster	124	194.9	34	58	8	12.6	188	295.5	36	9	14.1
Laurens	133	189.0	37	69			218	309.8	34	7	9.9
Lee	84	408.6	13	34			127	617.7	16	6	29.2
Lexington Marion	501	208.6 484.4	31	212 89	34	14.2	744 268	309.8 772.7	34 8	30 6	12.5 17.3
Marlboro	168 135	463.1	8 12	69		•	210	720.4	12	6	20.6
McCormick	28	273.8	23	7			54	528.1	20		
Newberry	88	233.0	27	38	10	26.5	139	368.1	27	11	29.1
Oconee	67	94.9	46	37			86	121.9	46		
Orangeburg Pickens	519 126	571.3 110.1	45 45	274 60	35 6	38.5 5.2	873 145	961.0 126.7	3 45	43 8	47.3 7.0
Richland	2,527	725.7	1	1049	135	38.8	4,187	1202.0	1	142	40.8
Saluda	42	220.4	29	16			59	309.6	35		
Spartanburg	592	218.4	30	276	27	10.0	884	326.1	30	36	13.3
Sumter	606	580.3	3	279	29	27.8	934	894.4	4	29	27.8
Union Williamsburg	54 206	190.8 570.6	36 5	25 93	11	30.5	97 302	342.7 836.4	29 5	. 14	38.8
York	316		41	151	23	11.6	555				11.1
Unknown	25			11			160				
		100.4		400				1000			
App I App II	329 1,170	132.4 220.1	13 9	169 594	11 57	4.4 10.7	492 1,785	198.0 335.8		15 59	6.0 11.1
App III	722	204.4	11	339	33	9.3	1,783			42	11.1
Catawba	500	169.2	12	235	33	11.2	848			32	10.8
Edisto	670	551.2	1	344	46	37.8	1,101			51	42.0
Low Country	599	266.7	7	276	33	14.7	984		7	38	16.9
Lower Sav Palmetto	467 3,192	251.3 491.1	8 2	249 1330	25 181	13.5 27.8	800 5,182				18.3 28.8
Pee Dee	1,256	372.9	4	605	53	15.7	2,107				21.7
Trident	2,074	343.8	5	1055	84	13.9	3,330	552.1	5		15.6
Upper Sav	455	207.7	10	201	17	7.8	867	395.8			14.2
Waccamaw Wateree	981 1,016	292.4 470.8	<u>6</u> 3	457 457	50 54	14.9 25.0	1,668 1,548				20.0 25.5
vvaleree	1,016	470.8	3	457	54	25.0	1,548	111.3	3	55	∠5.5
Out of State	3,241	N/A	N/A	1349	43	N/A					

Notes:

Data in this quarterly report are provisional. Case rate per 100,000 population based on 2000 census estimates.

Cells with 3 or fewer cases or deaths are set to missing (.).

AIDS cases are included in counts of HIV cases. HIV and AIDS data are categorized by year of diagnosis.

\*Out of State AIDS cases are included in "Total" Category.

\*\* Refer to the technical notes for information about the effect of the IDEP

\*\*Interstate Dunlication Evaluation Project) on AIDS and HIV case counts.

		S	outh Carol	ina Cases of T		is, Infectio Iarch 31, 2	us Syphilis, Go 007	onorrhea, a	nd Chlamy	/dia		
	Tot	al Syphilis	i	Infect	ious Syphi	lis	G	onorrhea			Chlamydia	
County/	Jan-Mar 2007	Jan-De	c 2006	Jan-Mar 2007	Jan-De	c 2006	Jan-Mar 2007	Jan-De		Jan-Mar 2007	Jan-Dec 2	
District	Cases	Cases	Rate	Cases	Cases	Rate	Cases	Cases	Rate	Cases	Cases	Rate
Total*	95	413	9.6	31	69	1.6	2,092	9,074	210.0	4,831	19,093	441.8
Abbeville	0	2	7.7	0	0	0.0		25	96.4	18	78	300.8
Aiken	1	10	6.6	1	2	1.3		238	156.8	107	552	363.6
Allendale	2 5	1 17	9.3 9.6	0	0	0.0	10 50	53	493.1	33 113	90 407	837.4 228.7
Anderson Bamberg	0	2	12.8	0	0	0.6	20	274 69	154.0 440.1	44	185	1180.0
Barnwell	0	2	8.6	0	0	0.0	8	27	116.1	32	98	421.2
Beaufort	2	6	4.2	1	1	0.7	38	175	123.2	153	511	359.7
Berkeley	0	3	2.0	0	0	0.0	45	173	113.6	105	367	241.0
Calhoun	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	3	16	106.5	7	25	166.4
Charleston Cherokee	6	<u>20</u> 5	6.0 9.3	3	7 1	2.1 1.9	234 35	1,059 177	319.1 328.5	545 43	2,016 176	607.4 326.6
Chester	1	9	27.4	0	1	3.0	14	99	301.1	43	181	550.6
Chesterfield	0	2	4.6	0	0	0.0	11	61	141.2	43	143	331.1
Clarendon	0	3	9.0	0	0	0.0	27	62	186.0	59	208	623.9
Colleton	1	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	21	60	152.0		149	377.5
Darlington	6	12	17.8	1	1	1.5	31	110	162.8	69	234	346.4
Dillon Dorchester	0	3 8	9.7 6.7	0	2 0	6.5 0.0	23 49	98 182	316.3 153.0	53 133	257 481	829.5 404.3
Edgefield	0	1	4.0	0	0	0.0	8	26	102.9	14	72	285.0
Fairfield	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	13	32	134.4	20	86	361.2
Florence	4	21	16.0	2	2	1.5	104	420	319.9	191	747	568.9
Georgetown	1	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	27	141	231.7	49	249	409.1
Greenville	10 6	33 19	7.9 27.9	2	3 0	0.7	182 18	821 195	196.8 285.9	313 56	1,461 268	350.2 392.9
Greenwood Hampton	0	19	4.7	0	1	4.7	5	32	150.5	27	208 87	409.1
Horry	2	24	10.1	2	9	3.8	91	510	213.8	220	916	384.1
Jasper	0	3	13.8	0	0	0.0	13	44	201.8	27	111	509.0
Kershaw	2	6	10.4	0	0	0.0	15	73	127.0	54	228	396.6
Lancaster	0	6	9.4	0	0	0.0	20	92	144.6		226	355.2
Laurens Lee	1 3	<u>6</u>	8.5 34.0	0	0	0.0	27 27	93 73	132.2 355.1	51 32	225 126	319.7 612.9
Lexington	3	15	6.2	1	3	1.2	57	229	95.4	192	762	317.3
Marion	2	8	23.1	0	2	5.8	31	134	386.3	58	266	766.9
Marlboro	3	3	10.3	1	0	0.0	21	74	253.8		147	504.3
McCormick	0	3	29.3	0	0	0.0	5	8	78.2	11	30	293.4
Newberry Oconee	0	7 1	18.5	0	0	0.0	14 3	47 36	124.5 51.0	32 28	185 133	489.9 188.5
Orangeburg	0	15	1.4 16.5	0	2	2.2	108	365	401.8	186	752	827.8
Pickens	0	4	3.5	0	0	0.0	11	63	55.0	37	210	183.5
Richland	15	62	17.8	10	22	6.3	306	1,327	381.1	865	2,828	812.1
Saluda	1	2	10.5	0	0	0.0	2	20	104.9	14	75	393.5
Spartanburg	3	17	6.3	0	0	0.0	144	590	217.6	241	1,079	398.0
Sumter Union	5 3	23	22.0 3.5	2	1 0	1.0	58 6	242 51	231.7 180.2	154 19	779 139	746.0 491.1
Williamsburg	2	7		0	6	16.6	30	83	229.9		161	445.9
York	3	13	6.5		2	1.0	60	292	146.7	145	576	289.4
Unknown	0	0		0	0		0	3		0	11	
Арр І	6	18		1	1	0.4	53	310	124.7		540	217.3
App II	10	37	7.0	2	3	0.6	193	884	166.3		1,671	314.3
App III Catawba	7	23	6.5	0	1	0.3	185	818 483	231.5		1,394	394.6
Edisto	0	28 17	9.5 14.0	2	3 2	1.0 1.6	94 131	483	163.4 370.2		983 962	332.6 791.5
Low Country	3	10	4.5	1	2	0.9	77	311	138.5		858	382.0
Lower Sav	3	13	7.0	2	2	1.1	78	318	171.1		740	398.2
Palmetto	18	84	12.9	11	25	3.8	390	1,635	251.6		3,861	594.0
Pee Dee	15	49	14.5	4	7	2.1	221	897	266.3		1,794	532.6
Trident Upper Sav	6 8	31 33	5.1 15.1	3	7	1.2 0.0	328 67	1,414 367	234.4 167.5		2,864 748	474.8 341.4
Waccamaw	5	33	9.2	2	15	4.5	148	734	218.8		1,326	395.3
Wateree	10	39	18.1	3	13	0.5	127	450	208.5		1,341	621.4
	101	33	10.1			0.0	121	700	200.0	239	1,041	021.5

Notes:
Data in this quarterly report are provisional.
Case rate per 100,000 population based on 2000 census estimates.

# **Using These Tables**

Α	$\rightarrow$							
A	\		Table 1					
	IDS Cases an	d Annual Ra	tes per 100,0	00 Populatio	n By County			
Cumula	tive Totals, P	revalence Ra	te, Ranked by	Rate and C	umulative De	aths*		
Incidence Rates,	Diagnosed Ja	anuary 1 - De	ecember 31, 1	999 and Jan	uary 1 - Dece	mber 31, 20	000	
			igh June 30, 2		Jan. 1 - Dec	:. 31, 1999	Jan. 1 - Dec	. 31, 2000
County	Cases	\Rate**	Rank	Deaths	Cases	Rate	Cases	Rate
Abbeville	19	72.6	46	10	4	16.2	#	#
Aiken	253	177.5		143	15	11.1	11	7.
Allendale	37	330.0	11	19	5	44.2	#	#
Anderson	189	114.0	42	96 42	17	10.4 36.8	16 5	9.7
Bamberg Barnwell	86 67	516.3 285.4	2 15	35	6 5	23.0	10	30.0 42.0
Beaufort	185	153.0	34	91	15	13.3	16	13.2
Berkeley	189	132.5	37	96	13	9.1	16	11.2
Calhoun	30	197.6	26	18	#	#	#	#
, dillouit		177.0		10	77*	TŤ.	77'	π
			County ranki	ng by rate				
Cumulative number of cases.			since 1982.	ing by rate				
Note if AIDS/HIV/STD case. Sou		agnosed Jan	uary - Decem	ber 1999 and	d 2000	ex		
	Cases Di	agnosed Jan e Totals by A	Age Group, E	ber 1999 and Exposure C	d 2000	ЭX		
	Cases Di	agnosed Jan re Totals by A Cumulativ	Age Group, E uary - Decem age Group and e Through Ju	ber 1999 and Exposure C	d 2000		nales	
Sou	Cases Di Cumulativ	agnosed Jan re Totals by A Cumulativ Ma	Age Group, E uary - Decem Ige Group and e Through Ju	ber 1999 and I Exposure C ne 2001	d 2000 ategory	Fem	iales	.31, 2000
	Cases Di Cumulativ * Jan. 1 - De	agnosed Jan re Totals by A Cumulativ Ma c. 31, 1999	Age Group, E uary - Decem Ige Group and e Through Ju Iles Jan. 1 - Dec	ber 1999 and I Exposure C ne 2001 :. 31, 2000	d 2000 ategory Jan. 1 - Dec	Fem :. 31, 1999	Jan. 1 - Dec	
Sou	Cases Di Cumulativ	agnosed Jan re Totals by A Cumulativ Ma	Age Group, E uary - Decem Ige Group and e Through Ju	ber 1999 and I Exposure C ne 2001	d 2000 ategory	Fem		. 31, 2000 %
Soundult/adolescent exposure category**:  Men who have sex with men	Cases Di Cumulativ * Jan. 1 - De Cases	agnosed Janne Totals by A Cumulativ  Ma c. 31, 1999	Age Group, E uary - Decem ge Group and e Through Jui lles Jan. 1 - Dec Cases	ber 1999 and d Exposure C ne 2001 :. 31, 2000 %	Jan. 1 - Dec	Fem :. 31, 1999	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases	%
Soundult/adolescent exposure category**:  Men who have sex with men njecting drug use	* Jan. 1 - De Cases	e Totals by A Cumulativ  Ma c. 31, 1999  % 34%	Age Group, E uary - Decem ge Group and e Through Jui lles Jan. 1 - Dec Cases	ber 1999 and Exposure C ne 2001 :. 31, 2000 % 32%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases	Fem :. 31, 1999 %	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A	
Soundult/adolescent exposure category**:  Men who have sex with men	* Jan. 1 - De Cases 226	agnosed Janier Totals by A Cumulativ  Ma c. 31, 1999  % 34% 10%	Age Group, E uary - Decem age Group and e Through Jui lles Jan. 1 - Dec Cases	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001 31, 2000 % 32% 9%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A	Fem :. 31, 1999 %	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A	% 9°
Sou  Adult/adolescent exposure category**  Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men who have sex with men & inject drugs	* Jan. 1 - De Cases 226 67 13	e Totals by A Cumulativ  Ma c. 31, 1999  % 34% 10% 2%	Age Group, E uary - Decem age Group and e Through Jui lles Jan. 1 - Dec Cases	ber 1999 and Exposure C ne 2001 :. 31, 2000 % 32% 9% 1%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A	Fem :. 31, 1999 % 8%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A	%
Sou  Adult/adolescent exposure category**  Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men who have sex with men & inject drugs Hemophilia/coagulation disorder	* Jan. 1 - De Cases 226 67 13	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulativ  Mac. 31, 1999  % 34% 10% 2% 0%	Age Group, E uary - Decem age Group and e Through Jui eles Jan. 1 - Dec Cases 193 53 9	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001 31, 2000 % 32% 9% 1% 0%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A	Fem :. 31, 1999 % 8%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2	% 99
Sou  Adult/adolescent exposure category**  Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men who have sex with men & inject drugs Hemophilia/coagulation disorder	* Jan. 1 - De Cases  226 67 13 - 149	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulativ  Mac. 31, 1999  % 34% 10% 2% 0%	Age Group, E uary - Decem age Group and e Through Jui eles Jan. 1 - Dec Cases 193 53 9	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001 31, 2000 % 32% 9% 1% 0%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A	Fem :. 31, 1999 % 8%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2	% 99
Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Menophilia/coagulation disorder deterosexual contact:  Sx w/ injecting drug use Sx w/ bisexual male	* Jan. 1 - De Cases 226 67 13 - 149 N/A	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulativ  Mac. 31, 1999  % 34% 10% 2% 0%	Age Group, E uary - Decem age Group and e Through Jui eles Jan. 1 - Dec Cases 193 53 9	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001 31, 2000 % 32% 9% 1% 0%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A - 192	Fem :. 31, 1999 % 8%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2 149	% 99
Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men philia/coagulation disorder deterosexual contact:  Sx w/ injecting drug use Sx w/ bisexual male Sx w/ person with hemophilia/	* Jan. 1 - De Cases  226 67 13 - 149 N/A 2	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulativ  Mac. 31, 1999  % 34% 10% 2% 0%	Age Group, E uary - Decem ge Group and e Through Jui les Jan. 1 - Dec Cases 193 53 9 - 116	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001 31, 2000 % 32% 9% 1% 0%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A - 192	Fem :. 31, 1999 % 8%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2 149	% 99
Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men who have sex with men & inject drugs demophilia/coagulation disorder deterosexual contact:  Sx w/ injecting drug user Sx w/ bisexual male Sx w/ person with hemophilia Sx w/ transfusion recipient w/HIV	* Jan. 1 - De Cases  226 67 13 - 149 N/A 1 2 1	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulativ  Mac. 31, 1999  % 34% 10% 2% 0%	Age Group, E uary - Decem ge Group and e Through Jui les Jan. 1 - Dec Cases 193 53 9 - 116	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001 31, 2000 % 32% 9% 1% 0%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A - 192 26 7	Fem :. 31, 1999 % 8%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2 149 15 6	% 99
Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men philia/coagulation disorder deterosexual contact:  Sx w/ injecting drug use Sx w/ bisexual male Sx w/ person with hemophilia/	* Jan. 1 - De Cases  226 67 13 - 149 N/A 1 2 1	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulativ  Mac. 31, 1999  % 34% 10% 2% 0%	Age Group, E uary - Decem ge Group and e Through Jui les Jan. 1 - Dec Cases 193 53 9 - 116	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001 31, 2000 % 32% 9% 1% 0%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A - 192 26 7	Fem :. 31, 1999 % 8%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2 149 15 6	% 99
Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men who have sex with men & inject drugs demophilia/coagulation disorder deterosexual contact:  Sx w/ injecting drug user Sx w/ bisexual male Sx w/ person with hemophilia Sx w/ transfusion recipient w/HIV Sx w/HIV+ person, risk not specified	Cases Di Cumulativ  Jan. 1 - De Cases  226 67 13 - 149 N/A 127	agnosed Janiere Totals by A Cumulative Mac. 31, 1999 % 34% 10% 2% 0% 23%	Age Group, E uary - Decem type Group and the Through Jui tes  Jan. 1 - Dec Cases 193 53 9 - 116 5 N/A 111	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001  3. 31, 2000  %  32%  9%  1%  0%  19%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A - 192 26 7 1 1 157	Fem 3. 31, 1999 % 8% 0% 62%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2 149 15 6 1 1	96 99 19 489
Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men who have sex with men & inject drugs Hemophilia/coagulation disorder Heterosexual contact:  Sx w/ injecting drug user Sx w/ bisexual male Sx w/ person with hemophilia Sx w/ transfusion recipient w/HIV Sx w/HIV+ person, risk not specified Receipt of blood transfusion/components	Cases Di Cumulativ  Jan. 1 - De Cases  226 67 13 - 149 N/A 1 2 1 127	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulative Mac. 31, 1999  % 34% 10% 2% 0% 23%	Age Group, E uary - Decem ge Group and e Through Jun lles Jan. 1 - Dec Cases 193 53 9 - 116 5 N/A 111	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001  3. 31, 2000  %  32%  9%  1%  0%  19%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A - 192 26 7 1 1 157	Fem :. 31, 1999 % 8% 0% 62%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2 149 15 6 1 1 - 127	96 99 19 489
Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men who have sex with men & inject drugs demophilia/coagulation disorder deterosexual contact:  Sx w/ injecting drug user Sx w/ bisexual male Sx w/ person with hemophilia Sx w/ transfusion recipient w/HIV Sx w/HIV+ person, risk not specified	Cases Di Cumulativ  Jan. 1 - De Cases  226 67 13 - 149 N/A 1 2 1 127 4 199	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulative Mac. 31, 1999 % 34% 10% 2% 0% 23%	Age Group, E uary - Decem ge Group and e Through June 1988	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001  3. 31, 2000  %  32%  9%  1%  0%  19%  0%  39%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A - 192 26 7 1 1 157	Fem 31, 1999 % 8% 0% 62%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2 149 15 6 1 1 - 127	96 99 19 489 489
Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men who have sex with men & inject drugs Hemophilia/coagulation disorder Heterosexual contact:  Sx w/ injecting drug user Sx w/ bisexual male Sx w/ person with hemophilia Sx w/ transfusion recipient w/HIV Sx w/HIV+ person, risk not specified Receipt of blood transfusion/components	Cases Di Cumulativ  Jan. 1 - De Cases  226 67 13 - 149 N/A 1 2 1 127	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulative Mac. 31, 1999  % 34% 10% 2% 0% 23%	Age Group, E uary - Decem ge Group and e Through June 1988	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001  3. 31, 2000  %  32%  9%  1%  0%  19%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A - 192 26 7 1 1 157	Fem :. 31, 1999 % 8% 0% 62%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2 149 15 6 1 1 - 127	96 99 19 489
Men who have sex with men njecting drug use Men who have sex with men & inject drugs demophilia/coagulation disorder deterosexual contact:  Sx w/ injecting drug user Sx w/ bisexual male Sx w/ person with hemophilia Sx w/ transfusion recipient w/HIV Sx w/HIV+ person, risk not specified	Cases Di Cumulativ  Jan. 1 - De Cases  226 67 13 - 149 N/A 1 2 1 127 4 199	agnosed Jamere Totals by A Cumulative Mac. 31, 1999 % 34% 10% 2% 0% 23%	Age Group, E uary - Decem ge Group and e Through Ju  les  Jan. 1 - Dec Cases  193  53  9  - 116  5  N/A  - 111  - 236  -	ber 1999 and Exposure Cone 2001  3. 31, 2000  %  32%  9%  1%  0%  19%  0%  39%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 26 N/A - 192 26 7 1 1 157	Fem 31, 1999 % 8% 0% 62%	Jan. 1 - Dec Cases N/A 29 N/A 2 149 15 6 1 1 - 127	96 99 19 489 489

## **TECHNICAL NOTES – March 31, 2007**

## **Legal Reporting Requirements in South Carolina**

HIV infection and AIDS cases are reportable in South Carolina by law. All physicians, hospitals, laboratories, administrators of health care facilities, charitable or penal institutions, etc., are required to report HIV infections and AIDS cases to DHEC with identifiers (See S.C. Code Ann. Sections 44-29-10, 70, and 80 (Supp. 1989); 24A S.C. Code Ann. Reg. 61-20 (Supp. 1989) and 24A S.C. Code Ann. Reg 61-21 (as amended). All information regarding sexually transmitted diseases including HIV and AIDS, reported to DHEC must be kept strictly confidential (See S.C. Code Ann. Section 44-29-135 (Supp. 1989).

## Surveillance and Reporting in South Carolina

Data in this report are provisional. The data are constantly updated to reflect the most accurate statistics. Reporting delays (time between diagnosis and report to DHEC) are as follows: approximately 84% of all AIDS cases are reported within 3 months of diagnosis; approximately 93% are reported within 6 months of diagnosis; about 95% are reported within 9 months diagnosis; approximately 96% are reported within 12 months of diagnosis; and 4% are reported more than 1 year after diagnosis.

Age group tabulations are based on person's age at diagnosis of HIV or AIDS; adult/adolescent cases include persons 13 years and older; pediatric AIDS cases include children under 13 years of age. Pediatric HIV positive children are not included in the HIV data until they are confirmed HIV positive at 18 months of age.

County tabulations are based on person's country of residence in South Carolina at the time of initial diagnosis of AIDS or HIV infection. For statistical purposes, the county data are never updated to reflect the migratory patterns that may occur. AIDS cases that are diagnosed outside of South Carolina are reflected in the out-of-state category. These cases are deemed out-of-state according to the jurisdiction policies set by the National Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).

Completeness of AIDS case reporting has been assessed in South Carolina. Findings from a validation study of 1999 hospital discharge data indicated that 97% of the inpatient AIDS-related discharges (cases) had been reported to the DHEC HIV/AIDS Surveillance Program ("Improvements in AIDS Case Reporting, South Carolina" <u>JAMA</u> 1991; 265(3):356).

In July of 2001, the CDC sent states an evaluation program to conduct in HARS on the timeliness of HIV and AIDS reports. The results from the project indicated that the South Carolina HIV/AIDS program was well above the standard of 66% of cases reported within six months of diagnosis. The result from the evaluation determined that the timeliness for HIV reporting was 92.7% and AIDS reporting was 87.2% within 6 months. Several factors contribute to these higher percentages:

1) HIV surveillance has been conducted since February 1986;

- 2) Both physicians and laboratories are required to report positive EIA/WB, CD4 T-Lymphocyte counts of <200 or <14%, and detected HIV RNA and positive DNA viral load results, and
- 3) Active surveillance activities are conducted by regional surveillance coordinators assigned to 4 areas throughout the state.

#### **CDC's AIDS Case Definition**

As of January 1, 1993, the National Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) AIDS case definition has been expanded to include the following AIDS - defining conditions in people with HIV infection:

CD4T-lymphocyte count less than 200/ uL or CD4 T-lymphocyte percent of total lymphocytes less than 14%
Pulmonary tuberculosis (TB disease)
Invasive cervical cancer
Recurrent pneumonia, within a 12 month period

According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDCP), the expanded HIV classification system and AIDS surveillance case definition is expected to increase the number of reported cases in 1993 by approximately 75%. The immediate increase in case reporting will largely be attributed to the addition of the severe immunosuppression to the definition.

The number of AIDS cases reported in South Carolina during January - March 1993 compared to January - March 1992 increased by 228%. This large increase was mainly attributable to the implementation of the CDC's Expanded HIV Classification system and AIDS surveillance case definition. This increase is also due to the expansion of surveillance efforts throughout South Carolina by the addition of staff referred to as regional surveillance coordinators. These regional surveillance coordinators are located in the 4 largest cities of the state (Charleston, Columbia, Florence, and Greenville) and are responsible for surveillance in the immediate areas surrounding them.

## **Exposure Categories**

A hierarchy of exposure categories designed by the Centers for Disease Control has always been used for surveillance purposes. Persons with more than one reported mode of exposure are classified in the category listed first in the hierarchy, except for men who have sex with other men and inject drugs. They comprise a separate category. In addition, "undetermined" refers to persons whose mode of exposure to HIV is unknown. This includes persons who are currently under investigation, persons who died before exposure history was obtained, persons who are lost to follow-up, or persons who refused to be interviewed. The large numbers of "undetermined" mode of exposure in the HIV data is attributed to the fact that exposure category information is presently only available on persons reported from DHEC clinics. Consequently, this caveat should be taken into consideration when using the HIV exposure category data. In the future, DHEC will be using a combined HIV/AIDS report form designed by the Centers for Disease Control that will allow us to collect mode of exposure for HIV infection in both DHEC clinics and non-DHEC settings.

#### Rates

Some rates in this report are cumulative rates; they are on a cumulative basis per 100,000 population. The numerators for computing the cumulative rate are based on the cumulative number of AIDS cases or HIV infection by county of residence. The denominators for computing rates are based on estimates of the 2000 census data (Division of Research and Statistical Services, State Data Center, South Carolina Budget and Control Board). Each rate is computed as the cumulative number of cases divided by the current year estimated population, multiplied by 100,000. Incidence rates are also included. The numerators for incidence rates are based on the number of AIDS cases or HIV infection during the year of report. Incidence rates are computed as the number of cases in the report year divided by the current year estimated population, multiplied by 100,000.

#### AIDS CASE RESIDENCY AND DEDUPLICATION EFFORTS

### **AIDS and HIV Case Reporting**

All states and U.S. territories have some form of HIV/AIDS reporting that incorporates reporting by individual medical care providers and/or laboratories conducting HIV related tests. This national effort enables public health surveillance staff to track the scope of the AIDS epidemic. It also allows the federal government to allocate funds equitably to the states for the care of people with HIV and AIDS who cannot pay for all or part of their treatment.

All states and areas have been reporting AIDS cases since 1986. Because of advances in treatment that have extended the time between HIV infection and a diagnosis of AIDS, states began instituting HIV reporting in 1985 as a way of understanding how the epidemic has changed and the progress of HIV disease. However, HIV case reporting is currently less standardized than AIDS case reporting. Some areas or states have only recently implemented HIV reporting and this reporting is not consistent across all areas. Therefore, AIDS case reports (also called surveillance data) are considered the only nationally representative data source for the epidemic.

## **Potential for Duplication**

The potential for duplication has become more of an issue because of the mobility of our society and also because of the success of treatment for HIV and AIDS. Persons with HIV or AIDS may move for reasons related to their infection, for example, to be near family or friends, to seek social support services, to seek more knowledgeable physicians, to seek experimental drug programs, or because of inability to work due to HIV disease. With the advent and success of highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART), those persons living relatively healthy lives may move for reasons unrelated to HIV or AIDS – to seek out new job opportunities or simply to fulfill a dream of living in a different place. This mobility increases the challenge of avoiding duplication in counting persons with AIDS across different jurisdictions throughout the US.

To counter the potential problem of duplication, CDC initiated the Interstate **Duplication Evaluation Project (IDEP) in 2002.** This considerable effort compared patient

records in the national database across states in order to identify potential duplicate cases. The following process was used.

- 1. CDC reviewed the national case reports sent to CDC through December 2001 for duplications. Because CDC does not receive names of patients, a match of information consisting of soundex (which is a code for the last name), date of birth, and gender identified potential duplications.
- 2. CDC provided states with a listing of all cases that were potential duplicates from other states. CDC also included additional supporting information such as diagnosis and death dates to assist states in their attempts to determine whether persons were the same or different individuals.
- 3. States contacted each other to compare their patient profiles along with additional information available at the state level that is not reported to CDC.
- 4. Based on their discussions, the states decided whether the cases represented the same person. If they did, the states determined the state of residency at the date of diagnosis.
- 5. The states forwarded these decisions to CDC, which returned them, after processing and quality control, to the states for updating their surveillance databases.

After de-duplication, the numbers of cumulative diagnosed AIDS cases in individual states will most likely decrease, as will the overall national numbers. CDC estimates that the decreases on the national level will be less than 5% of the AIDS cases reported over the entire history of the HIV epidemic.

How has this de-duplication effort affected the states' numbers of AIDS cases? Preliminary data suggest that there are, on average about 300 duplicate cumulative AIDS cases per state, although that ranged from 0 to over 3000 for individual states. This means that, again on average, that there were about 5% duplicate AIDS cases per state, although that ranged from 0 to 10%.

#### INCREASE IN CASES OF DIAGNOSED CHLAMYDIA

There is a noticeable increase in the number of diagnosed cases of Chlamydia starting in 2004. This is due in part to a new test assay being used that is more sensitive. The new test being used this year (Aptima) has enabled better detection of Chlamydia, and, therefore more cases are being diagnosed that would have been previously undetected. There is also an increase in the number of providers reporting Chlamydia cases in 2004.